DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 808 UD 019 359

AUTHOR Carter, Donald L., Ed.
TITLE Debate and Understanding--Symposium No. 4, 1978: Myths and Realities About Historically Black Colleges in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION Boston Univ., Mass. Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Academic Services and Minority Affairs.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 38p.; For related documents, see UD 019 360-362; Not available in hard copy due to print size of the original document
JOURNAL CIT Debate and Understanding: A Journal for the Study of Minority Americans' Economic, Political and Social Development; 1978

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Black Achievement; *Black Colleges; *Black Education; *Black History; College Preparation; College Segregation; *Educational History; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Problems; *Financial Problems; Higher Education; Periodicals; Racial Discrimination

ABSTRACT

This journal contains articles reporting on different aspects of black higher education in the United States. A survey of myths about black colleges reveals that black colleges range from the strong to the weak, just as do white colleges, and that they are no more segregated than white colleges. An examination of the history of black education and the present situation of black colleges shows that graduates of black colleges were trained to serve the black community exclusively. Black colleges have continued to take academically unprepared students and turn out graduates able to compete successfully with graduates from white institutions. All this has been without much Federal aid until recently. No significant national commitment to the higher education of blacks existed prior to 1968. The role of black colleges is compensatory in terms of the continuing default of American higher education to be more responsive to the needs of black students. There is a special need to aid blacks so that they can take advantage of opportunities for study in science and engineering, since secondary schools are failing to prepare blacks for this kind of college work. (MC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170408

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. H. Hughes, Jr.
M.L. King Center
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Debate & Understanding

A Journal for the Study of Minority Americans' Economic, Political and Social Development.

SYMPOSIUM #4: Myths and Realities About Historically Black Colleges in Higher Education

Table of Contents

Myths About Black Colleges: An Introduction
by Hugh M. Gloster 217

Myths and Realities Concerning the Black Colleges in Higher Education
by C. Clyde Williams 221

The Black Protest Tradition of Historically Black Colleges: A Comparative Analysis of Historically Black and Historically White Institutions
by Elias Blake, Jr. 228

A Prime Assignment for Black Colleges: Role of Blacks in the Sciences and Related Fields
by Herman Branson 240

UDO 19360
UDO 19361
UDO 19362

DEBATE AND UNDERSTANDING is the official publication of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Academic Services and Minority Affairs at Boston University. It is a journal designed to investigate the social forces which have affected the articulation of minority Americans' institutions and affairs. The views expressed in this journal are not necessarily the views held by the editorial staff or the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center of Boston University.

Publisher and Editor, RONALD L. CARTER
Assistant Editor, DONNA ENNIS
Assistant Editor, CYRENA TELESFORD
Editorial Assistant, LOUIS PORTER
Editorial Assistant, COLES RUFF
Editorial Assistant, FRANCINE LOCKER

UDO 19359

Published by the Center for Academic Services and Minority Affairs, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center at Bostor University. Address all correspondences to DEBATE AND UNDERSTANDING, MLK, JR. Center, 178 Bay State Rd., Boston, Mass. 02215. Copyright © 1978 by Martin Luther King, Jr. Center. All rights reserved by DEBATE AND UNDERSTANDING, Boston University. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the editor.

Myths About Black Colleges: An Introduction

BY HUGH M. GLOSTER, *President of Morehouse College*

IN the United States today there are 107 black colleges and universities located in fifteen Southern states, four Northern states, and the District of Columbia. These institutions enroll more than 200,000 students and annually confer more than 30,000 degrees.

In this country black colleges came into being as a result of white racism. Since Negroes were admitted to Northern colleges only in token numbers (prior to the Civil War only 28 American blacks were college graduates) and to Southern colleges not at all, these schools were established to meet the educational needs of black students. The pioneering institutions were Lincoln University in Pennsylvania in 1854 and Wilberforce University in Ohio in 1856. These two institutions were followed by a number of other schools that were opened in the South during the years after the Civil War. At the time of their founding these institutions generally provided instruction at the elementary and secondary levels but called themselves normal schools, colleges, or universities in order to indicate the kind of institutions they hoped to become.

One of the unsung sagas of American higher education is the success of black colleges, despite the pressures of prejudice and poverty, in providing higher educational opportunities for blacks during the one hundred years between the opening of Lincoln University in 1854 and the announcement of the Supreme Court decision banning segregation in public education in 1954. Of equal significance is the contribution of black colleges in training teachers who taught black youth in elementary and secondary schools and wiped out most of the black illiteracy in the country. The important role of black colleges in American higher education is indicated in a recent United Negro College Fund report which points out that among their 400,000 alumni are 75 percent of both the black Ph.D.'s and the black military officers, 80 percent of both the black federal judges and the black executives in business and industry, 85 percent of the black physicians, and a majority of the other black professionals in the United States.

Despite the impressive achievements of black colleges in producing black professionals and leaders for more than a century, these institutions have operated in a system of segregation and outside the mainstream of American higher education during most of their history. This separateness is clearly indicated by Christopher Jencks and David Reisman in the following statement from the *Harvard Educational Review* for the summer of 1976 concerning their afterthought decision to include a chapter on black colleges in their own book, and the scant attention given to black colleges by themselves and twenty co-authors in *The American College* (1962):

> . . . our decision to include a chapter on Negro colleges came only after the civil rights movement had thrust them into prominence. When we wrote our first joint article five years ago attempting to describe the American academic enterprise, we devoted only two sentences to Negro colleges, and our twenty co-authors in that 1,000-page volume never mentioned these colleges by name at all.

Because black colleges have generally been racially isolated in American society and separated from white colleges and universities until recent years, several myths have developed that are just as damaging to these black institutions as ethnic stereotypes are to America's black population.

Myth No. 1: Black colleges rank at the lowest level of American higher education.

This particular myth has been supported by legal decisions and scholarly studies. In ruling against segregation in public schools, for example, the United States Supreme Court declared, "Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." Moreover, in their study of equality of educational opportunity in 1966, James S. Coleman and his associates concluded that black schools and students are inferior to their white counterparts. Furthermore, in their article on "The American Negro College" in the *Harvard Educational Review* for the Winter of 1967, Jencks and Reisman called black colleges "an academic disaster area," "an ill-financed, ill-staffed caricature of white higher education."

Many Americans, assuming that any racially segregated school is inferior and that the weaknesses of some black colleges are characteristic of all, rank these institutions together on the bottom rung of the ladder of American higher education. The fact is that these institutions, like predominantly white colleges, are of varying types and sizes and range from the strong to the weak. Some are public, and others are private; some are church-related, and others are independent; some are liberal arts colleges, and others have comprehensive programs. In academic quality they range all the way from Fisk, Howard, and Morehouse to unaccredited colleges which are desperately struggling for survival. In other words, black colleges rank all along the line; and, as Earl J. McGrath observes in *The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition* (1965), "except at the topmost level of excellence represented by a few celebrated institutions, the Negro institutions run the entire gamut of quality within American higher education." Moreover, by any objective standard of measurement, they are similar to their white counterparts, which also vary greatly, in terms of faculty competence, curricular strength, student ability, library resources, and alumni achievements.

Myth No. 2: Black colleges are weak in academic quality.

The fact is that many black colleges have impressive credentials in the academic field. Fisk, Howard, and Morehouse have chapters of Phi Beta Kappa; and Morehouse is one of only four colleges in the state of Georgia holding membership in this prestigious honor society. Morehouse is also outstanding among small liberal arts colleges in the percentage (more than 60 percent) of Ph.D.'s on the faculty and of seniors going on to graduate and professional schools as well as in the number of alumni who have earned the Ph.D., M.D., D.D.S., and J.D. degrees. It should also be observed that the overwhelming majority of the unaccredited colleges in the United States are predominantly white.

Myth No. 3: Black colleges are impoverished.

While most black colleges are poor, at least two of them—Hampton and Tuskegee—have respectable endowments which are larger than those of some well-known universities. According to data in *American Universities and Colleges* (1973), edited by W. Todd Furniss, Hampton and Tuskegee have endowments with market values of $28,892,511 and $19,576,859, respectively. The endowments of Hampton and Tuskegee surpass those of George Washington University ($14,349,567), Temple University ($7,653,060), Fordham University ($7,538,000), Boston College ($5,800,079), American University ($4,979,527), and Roosevelt University ($1,698,652).

Myth No. 4: White students shun black colleges because these institutions are weak and poor.

The fact is that white students who enroll in black colleges usually enter these schools because they offer the best available education at the lowest possible cost. If a low-income white student has access in his community to

predominantly white colleges that he can attend at low cost, he will usually enter one of these institutions rather than a black school. In other words, if such a white student lives in Atlanta, where he has access to a number of predominantly white colleges, public and private, he will generally not enroll at Morehouse, which is regarded as one of the strongest colleges in the state. On the other hand, if the white student lives in a community where the only institution of higher education is a black college and if he does not have sufficient funds to attend a predominantly white college away from home, he will frequently enter the black college, especially if it is a low-cost public institution.

In considering enrollment in black colleges, many white students are inhibited by precedent and prejudice. Some do not wish to attend a predominantly black institution, and others would prefer not to associate with blacks at all. Regardless of their feelings about attending black colleges, white students are often discouraged by relatives and friends if they consider doing so and are considered eccentric or unconventional if they actually enroll. Jencks and Reisman contend that white students who attend black colleges do so for a mixture of "idealistic, exploratory, and neurotic reasons." In this connection, Daniel C. Thompson quotes a white female student at a black college in *Private Black Colleges at the Crossroads* (1973):

> I never get through explaining why I chose this college. It seems that everywhere I go—the church, beauty parlor, shopping, visiting, or what—people question me about this college and why I came here. They refuse to accept the fact that it is a good college and I like here better than I'd perhaps like any other college. They want to believe that there must be some deep psychological or social reasons which I cannot or will not reveal. Even my parents seem to feel that I am some kind of freak or deviant.

Myth No. 5: Black colleges promote segregation.

Although American colleges are no longer legally segregated, some observers allege that black colleges try to limit their enrollments to black students. These charges are usually made by white students who are looking for reasons for avoiding enrollment at black colleges or are experiencing feelings of racial isolation in these institutions. While some black students are unfriendly to white students at black colleges, the doors of all black colleges are open to white students and no accredited black college has followed an exclusionary policy.

Myth No. 6: Now that segregated schools are banned by the Supreme Court, black colleges are no longer needed.

During a meeting at the White House with a group of black college presidents in May of 1970, President Richard M. Nixon asked if there was any need for black colleges after implementation of the Supreme Court decision of 1954 forbidding segregation in public education.

It is surprising that any knowledgeable person—and especially the President of the United States—should consider that black colleges no longer serve any useful purpose since white colleges are open to black students. Why should the integration of American higher education not be a two-way process, with black students going to formerly all-white schools and white students going to previously all-black schools? Why should black colleges be closed when they are growing at approximately the same rate as other American colleges? Why should black students be denied the advantages that accrue from attending black colleges when Catholic students are given the advantages that derive from attending Catholic colleges?

Experience has shown that black students gain ethnic as well as educational benefits from attending a black college. In the first place, the black college provides a place where black students can be in the majority and escape the racial tensions and frustrations of a minority person on a white campus.

Second, the black college gives culturally and economically disadvantaged black students a better opportunity to overcome weak elementary and secondary school backgrounds, to do successful college work, and to enter graduate and professional schools or obtain satisfactory employment in the American marketplace.

Third, the black college helps black students to overcome the stigma of racial inferiority that has been cultivated during two and a half centuries of slavery and a century of segregation, and inspires them to develop feelings of pride and identity that will help them to meet the problems and challenges of the future.

Fourth, the black college serves as a repository of books, magazines, and other materials dealing with the black experience in Africa and America. Through the study of this subject matter, black students can analyze and interpret the history, life, and aspirations of black people.

Fifth and finally, the black college develops leaders who conduct protest and programs for racial progress and try to eliminate the discrimination that black people experience in health, housing, education, and employment in this country. It is no accident that most of the civil rights leaders from W. E. B. DuBois to Martin Luther King, Jr. are graduates of black colleges.

As we observe the ethnic side-values that accompany higher education in a black college, we feel that black colleges would have to be established to meet the needs of black people if they did not already exist.

ED170409

Myths and Realities Concerning the Black Colleges in Higher Education: A Lodestar for a Historical Analysis

BY C. CLYDE WILLIAMS, *President of Miles College*

THEY traveled all night, father, mother and daughter, from Sarasota, Florida. Mrs. Harris was a domestic worker; Mr. Harris was unemployed. They had desired an education for their only daughter, but like so many black families, they had no money. They were told by their minister that if they took her to a certain college she could get financial help and a very good education. Moving on faith and no money, they arrived on the campus and to the president's office and related to him their plight. As has been so many times in the past, the president and the college, not realizing where funds would come from, provided the opportunity for the student. To have denied this student at least a chance would have brought despair and hopelessness to a potential teacher, lawyer, doctor, computer analyst. This student graduated with honors and was the first black woman to become a CPA in the state where she now resides with her family.

This story is just one of the thousands that can be told about the many and peculiar roles that black colleges have played in America and the impact they have had on higher education. In order to understand and appreciate the significance of the role black colleges historically have played in American higher education, one must know of their struggling past to appreciate their promising future.

The history of education for blacks dates back to the moment the first black captive slave set foot on the land whose occupancy would for three hundred years rob him of his pride, dignity, and his humanity and remind him of "his place" in society. Toiling from sunup to sundown the slave realized that it was ultimately through the educational process that he would gain respect and freedom. Thus he had to free his mind before he could free his body. Though possessed of untutored intellects, these men decided that they must build institutions, however small, for their children and for future generations. L. H. Holsey, a slave who later became bishop in the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, tells how as a slave his thirst for knowledge led him eventually to organize Paine Institution in 1870 (now Paine College, Augusta, Georgia).

> In 1857, when my second owner, Mr. T. L. Wynn, died, I became the property of Col. R. M. Johnston. In the early winter of that year he went to Athens, Ga., and became a professor in the State College. As an important part of his effects, I was carried along with him and his family as carriage driver, house servant, and gardener. I was then fifteen years of age. As soon as I arrived in Athens, I felt an insatiable craving for some knowledge of books, and especially I was anxious to learn to read the Bible. What must I do? I was a slave and could not attend school, and it was considered unwise, if not dangerous, for slaves to read and write. But my owners, although strict, were very kind, especially my master. So I determined to learn to read at all hazards, and take whatever risks there might be connected with it. There was a junk house in the city where rags were sold. I gathered and saved all the rags that I could, and sold them that I might get some money with which to buy books.
>
> The murmuring brook that rolled below whispered to me the presence of God, the wonders of his providence, and the marvels of his hand. Here, in the deep solitudes of silent nature, retired and alone, I spent the greater part of two years. Here I studied reading, writing, geography, grammar, arithmetic, astronomy, history, and theology (Holsey, 1898, pp. 16 & 19).

Historically, colleges, like many other institutions, came into existence to serve the public interest and to meet the specific needs of individuals who desired higher levels of intellectual growth than secondary schools

UD 019 360

offered. The clientele of earlier colleges was the middle class segment of society. American higher education was designed to meet the growing needs of the social order more than the essential needs and the problems of the individual. The earlier colleges were founded during a period when the country was in the process of development. Unlike some other countries, America was not considered a true intellectual society. Rather this country has highlighted with pride its capitalism, its political system, its farms, its industrialization, and its technology. Consequently, the educational establishment reflected this societal and cultural stratification and organization (McGrath, 1963, p. 25).

Education for blacks, on the other hand, did not evolve from the mores, customs, and acculturations of the majority American culture. Education for blacks emerged from the limitations imposed by a slave experience, and by discrimination resulting from a segregated social system. It was quite evident after the Civil War that there was an urgent need to establish schools directly relevant to the conditions and problems of the newly-freed black citizens. Who would train the much-needed teachers, doctors, ministers, and other leaders who would minister to the growing needs of the illiterate, disorganized, oppressed and disadvantaged ex-slave? It was during this post-Civil War period that the historically black colleges came into existence. Generally these black colleges were established by different religious denominations and it is primarily for this reason that most of the black colleges are private (Bowles and DeCosta, 1971, p. 33).

These colleges founded for "Negroes" provided preachers and teachers, a few medical doctors and dentists to serve the black community exclusively. These colleges also prepared manual skillsmen who served numerous white enterprises. Regarding restricted career opportunities, the Commission on Higher Educational Opportunities asserted:

> The first task was to survive for literacy and the skills needed to earn a living. As time passed, the liberal arts were added as a basis for understanding Western culture. If these colleges had not existed, many outstanding Negro scholars, professional leaders and other well-known personalities would have been denied opportunities for growth. In spite of limited resources, these institutions diversified their offerings and were able to equip their students for the limited openings available to them. The wide variation in quality among these institutions today results from many factors, the two most significant being the relative strength of financial resources and the quality of leadership, both on the campus and within the church. (pp. 27-28)

According to a report by the Southern Education Foundation (1972):

> Colleges created to serve black Americans have existed in the United States for more than 135 years. Both church and state participated in the development of black colleges: both are still involved in their operation. Although the colleges could not have survived without that support, it may also be true that they endured in spite of those white-dominated institutions. In any event, most of them have endured.

There are some 107 black colleges and universities in America consisting of private 2-year and 4-year institutions, public 2-year and 4-year institutions, as well as graduate and professional schools located in 15 southern states, four northern states, and the District of Columbia. The institutions enroll upwards of 200,000 students and graduate more than 30,000 students annually with undergraduate, graduate and professional degrees.

These institutions, serving a clientele of young people who have been shortchanged both in society and in the schools, provide the opportunity to attain skills. It is at the black college where black students can find both the personal attention and matriculation needed for success in education committed to an open society. The black college is the only place where racial and economic disadvantages can be overcome.

Herbert O. Reid of the Howard University School of Law, in the Amicus Curiae Brief prepared to defend black colleges from being included in the Adams vs. Richardson desegregation suit, as if they were guilty of

racial discrimination as white colleges, advanced ideas in the legal record that resulted in a judicial notice of the future importance of black colleges in achieving parity. The brief states:

> This class of black institutions without exception have, from the very beginning of their existence, been open to all races, sexes, colors, and creeds.
>
> Black institutions have been more profoundly representative of the American Ethic than the larger more affluent schools of higher education. Indeed, they have been and remain today a domestic 'Marshall Plan' committed to a public offering of educational attainment (rather than) an illusory expectancy of educational opportunity ... (they) make educational opportunities a reality rather than an empty expectation ...

In a speech given at Dillard University recently Harold Howe, II, Vice President, Ford Foundation, lists four common denominators of black colleges:

> (1) They all were founded to serve black people because other colleges would not admit them or because state policy required segregation of the races, and they provided virtually all the education this country offered to blacks for almost 100 years; (2) They were ill-supported by both private and public money and still are, and in this sense they have suffered in America the same secondhand citizenship that individual black people have experienced; (3) As the white colleges of the country have suddenly opened their doors to blacks in the last twenty years, these ill-supported institutions have been suddenly thrown into competition with such places as the University of Wisconsin and Harvard for students, for faculty, and for funds, and in spite of their handicaps, they have improved their services and increased their enrollments; and (4) They are black colleges in only two senses: that they were founded to serve black people who were unserved elsewhere, and that what has been achieved at them has been won largely through black leadership. Otherwise they are open to all who wish to apply.

Black colleges took disadvantaged human materials and produced a national human resource that was essential to the leadership and professional roles of our society. Attention has focused on these institutions to determine their qualifications for the calibre of students they educated. At the same time, more prestigious institutions of higher education became interested in this "disadvantaged" clientele, and educational scientists became interested in the methods and philosophies characterized by black institutions.

The advent of the civil rights movement of the '60's, which challenged the black man's status in the American social order, brought with it an examination of the status of higher education in the United States in general and a close scrutiny of black institutions of higher education in particular.

Since that time, the black college has been the subject of much discussion by educational futurists throughout the United States. Many critical observers began questioning the place of traditionally black institutions in the arena of education. There was the mistaken belief that when the white institutions finally decided to enroll a token number of black students, the historic role that the black college had played would be no longer needed and that the white institutions would assume the role the black college had played in American higher education. There was also the mistaken belief that the conspiracy initiated during the Nixon Administration and by some private sources to cut off funding to the black colleges would lead to their demise. When the Federal government decided to cut off support to the black college, some foundations followed this pattern. It was no accident that the same black institutions that were singled out by some foundations as those worthy of survival received, at the same time, substantial Federal support. The strong historical tide that swept the schools into national prominence was too strong to allow short-sighted bureaucrats to determine the future of the black college.

Studies upon studies have been conducted which always substantiate the fact that black colleges have succeeded in accomplishing what many of the renowned institutions of higher education (even the Ivy League schools) have been unable to accomplish. The colleges in question have always taken academically unprepared students and turned

out graduates who have competed and are still competing successfully with graduates of white institutions. Not only have these graduates competed successfully, but for the last two decades they have helped the nation to recognize the racially-motivated inconsistency in standards and values as they exist in America.

Although integration during the 60's and 70's resulted in numerous Ivy League colleges and others draining off promising black students and highly trained faculties of black private and public colleges and universities, today there seems to be a reversed trend.

Many black students who were lured to these prestigious institutions by attractive, lucrative scholarships, and faculty members who were enticed by exorbitant salaries and incomparable fringe benefits, have become disillusioned with high prestige institutions. To their dismay, a substantial number of black faculty members were placed in positions where they could not exert any authority. In other situations they were in charge of Afro-American Studies, which was a very popular addition to most college curricula during the high days of the civil rights struggle.

Reports on the status of Afro-American Studies on numerous campuses around the country indicate that generally Afro-American Studies programs are on the wane or have phased out. Some institutions have merged these programs with other long established programs.

Some black students who were recipients of lucrative scholarships have said that they were overwhelmed by feelings of isolation and alienation. Human and material resources were in abundance, but they contended that these attributes did not lessen their feelings of invisibility. Thus a number of black students and faculty members have returned to predominantly black campuses because of the reasons stated and for other reasons as well. Many black students discovered that these traditionally white institutions did not provide the historical black experience to which the black student was accustomed.

There are some myths suggested by those in the society at large, and even by some in the black community, in an effort to discredit these historical institutions:

1. That blacks attending white institutions are more prone to be successful than those attending black institutions;
2. That black colleges only attract poorly-prepared and inferior students;
3. That black colleges by their very nature are inferior;
4. That black colleges are authoritarian;
5. That black colleges are academically weak;
6. That black colleges are financially unsound;
7. That universally under poor management, both academically and financially, they have no recognized administrative standards and procedures.

Those who hold to these views would tend to discredit the education of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Alabama State Senator U. W. Clemon, Atlanta's Mayor Maynard Jackson, Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, Georgia State Senator Julian Bond, PUSH President Jesse Jackson and Alabama State Senator J. Richmond Pearson. These are just a few examples of the many, many achievers who are products of historically black institutions.

Further analysis of the current debate on black colleges shows that it is immensely important that blacks and whites realize that the quality of academic institutions, like other societal institutions, ranges from superior to inferior and that both black and white institutions can be found in all categories—there are some superior, mediocre and poor black and white colleges.

Many incompetent or inferior white colleges continue to operate, and if they do close it is never because of inferiority, it is simply for "economic reasons." Black colleges that are no worse and in some instances better, are constantly admonished to cease operating because they are "inferior."

The examination and eradication of all myths such as these perpetrated about black colleges should be a priority item for all Americans. To do otherwise places America in the position of condoning blatant racism and outright discrimination.

To be sure, black colleges, both private and public, have been inundated with many and severe survival problems. There is no lulling ourselves into thinking that crucial conditions do not exist for black academic institutions. A tunnel view must not be taken if black colleges are to remain relevant. Their traditional roles must be re-examined in light of changing career patterns, educational needs, emerging opportunities, community development and all other forces that are a part of the social upheaval of today. The black college must also continue to address itself to the inequities which still exist in our society.

A deep sense of logic makes us totally aware that far reaching changes that have taken place in the past 10 years and are taking place in our society and in education in the United States, require that black educational institutions alter educational goals in keeping with the changing nature of modern society. Changes such as: population shifts, expansion of population, rapid mobility of people, changing vocational and occupational needs, growing urban area demanding a variety of services, the crisis of our inner cities, and greater concern for quality as well as demands for higher levels of education, require effectuated programs to meet these needs.

A number of pragmatic and administrative changes must be made if the black colleges are to maintain a place in the competitive higher education arena. According to Dr. Mack Jones (*Daedalus*, 1971, pp. 740-741):

> Black colleges must radically restructure both curricular and extracurricular activities. Social sciences, humanities and the arts, and education curricula must be recast so that the beginning of all analysis is Africa and the problems of black people living in America; all other knowledge must be interpreted from that very beginning. For example, the history of African people would replace the course in Western civilization as the lodestar for historical analysis; political science courses would be concerned with acquiring and manipulating power to produce radical change rather than with maintaining a stable commonwealth. . . . Black colleges have the power to remake the political consciousness of the black student and ultimately of the black nation. That is their primary responsibility to the larger black community.

The Carnegie Commission Report has clearly defined the position in which predominantly black colleges find themselves. The Report states that:

> Emerging now from a century of isolation from the mainstream of a predominantly white educational system, the Black colleges are in a period of intense transition. Few institutions of higher education today face both deeper challenges to their survival and greater opportunities for service. Despite the alienation imposed on them by a segregated America, these schools are now struggling to meet stern competition within the system and the challenges of an emerging American ideal enriched by Black culture. . . . (The Carnegie Commission, 1971, p. 4)

Recent accountability requirements imposed upon the world of higher education by the public through elected state and federal representatives have created a degree of competitiveness among colleges for students. This competitiveness has been most recently exemplified through increased services to the state by state supported institutions, expansion of program offerings by private institutions and recruitment efforts directed toward the special student or the student who, because of socioeconomic inequities, is not conditioned to compete effectively in many institutions of higher education. Comprehensive efforts such as this have increased the enrollments, thus justifying larger state appropriations and increased Federal funding. Such support aids institutions in their growth and development and creates new missions for colleges. Funds for institutions have gradually increased since the Second World War. Prior to that time there was little Federal support for higher education other than monies provided to land grant colleges. The Carnegie Commission Report (1971) pointed out that the bulk of Federal funds between the years 1948 and 1964 was spent in the areas of research, basic science and technology. Rivlin (1961) further documented this point. His statement which documented the many advantages of Federal monies reiterated that until 1965, the major government-academic alliance revolved

around scientific research, new knowledge, new technology, and the spread of innovative techniques to meet national goals.

Since the black colleges did not possess the physical or human resources to accomplish notable breakthroughs in the areas of science and technology, they did not receive substantial government aid. Those institutions which were chosen for Federal assistance usually received funds as a result of having land grant status. It has not been until recently that the black colleges could depend upon the Federal government for substantial support. According to Phifer (1973), in order to meet the needs of the black colleges Federal aid should rise to a much higher level than the approximately $200 million envisaged for the 1973 school year.

The Federal government, although not as generous with funds to "developing institutions" as administrators for these institutions might wish, has launched an effort to increase support. Through Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1975, specific monies have now been earmarked for aid to "developing institutions."

Several black institutions such as Tuskegee Institute (Alabama), Clark College (Georgia), Spelman College (Georgia), Alabama A. & M. University (Alabama), and Miles College (Alabama) have received substantial grants to improve planning, organizing, directing, staffing, coordinating, and budgeting functions.

Funds such as those provided through Title III of the Higher Education Act and monies from private sources are insuring that the goals, priorities, and objectives of many black colleges are identified. These funds are also assisting the schools in designing systematic schemes of events, activities, and tasks for the accomplishment of such goals and priorities.

Black college administrators have long since realized that funds alone would not solve the complex problems facing black colleges. The uncertain environment in which they operated indicated the need for comprehensive planning sequenced by continuity and interaction in order to accomplish optimum results. These administrators are devising more effective systems for: (1) correcting declining enrollments, (2) counterbalancing keener competition for faculty for reasons other than financial, (3) meeting the needs of black youths who are demanding a better quality of education, (4) offsetting undesirable or obsolete locations, (5) affecting recruitment of black students since many high schools have been absorbed by white schools and (6) program offerings in technical and professional skills which our technologically oriented society requires.

Black college administrators, faculties, and students throughout America are working together in analyzing, designing, clarifying, classifying, facilitating, and evaluating programs accentuating goals in building an understanding of the history of black institutions of higher education, their roles, their development, and their future.

Consortial, cooperative, and bilateral arrangements are but a few of the mechanisms being implemented by black colleges. These are united efforts to: (1) arrive at an understanding of the structures and functions of modern society, (2) analyze the social, political, economic, physical and mental forces which are affecting blacks today, (3) estimate the impact of these forces on black colleges now and in the future, (4) pinpoint strategies for successful living in our future society by researching and analyzing problems blacks face in communities throughout America and finally, (5) formulate ways by which black colleges may interact and actively cooperate with other individuals and groups in developing solutions and alternatives to problems which not only black people but all people in America face.

New planning strategies are now being sought to provide administrators, faculties, and staffs at black colleges with the opportunity to compete for human and financial resources with their peers at major institutions. They are engaged in activities that will improve and enrich the conditions under which these colleges have operated, so that

black colleges may be assimilated into the mainstream of higher education.

Historically, the black college's mission was to serve students who came from certain educational, cultural, social, or racial groups. This is still the black college's mission. However, its mission has been broadened in order to serve a variety of students. To meet the needs of a variety of clientele, many black colleges are expanding their capabilities and creating programs in a wide range of fields which are new to these institutions.

As noteworthy as the past performance of historically black colleges might be, this does not relieve the problems which they face today in regard to the need to focus immediate attention on systems planning procedures and comprehensive educational planning. Many of the black academic institutions are achieving creative and systematic organization of resources—including human, technological, physical, and fiscal—designed to achieve specified and measurable objectives.

All of the "myths and realities" prevailing about the black college in higher education and its future can be debated along two lines of thought. The negative would argue that black colleges are irrelevant, that the future looks dim and ominous, and that with the passing of time society will witness the demise of all black academic institutions that have not already folded under the weight of integration and desegregation. The affirmative acclaims that there is hope for survival of many black colleges, if not all of them. This group rationalizes that a re-thinking and re-structuring of programs and priorities have geared most black colleges to go forward with their specified missions.

This commentary takes the affirmative viewpoint both from a subjective and objective point of view. It asserts that the present age is one of change and upheaval for black colleges, much like the early days of their origin. Although the problems of today differ vastly from those of a century ago, the black college's mission is the same. The evolution of time has demanded that the mission be restated to address itself to the times. However, in whatever manner stated, it still signifies that the specific goals of black colleges are: to initiate and develop significant programs that will prepare students for varied career opportunities, and to equip their graduates for meeting the demands placed upon citizens in our multifaceted society.

The loss of black colleges to the nation and to the black community would be, in reality, an immeasurable educational and cultural loss.

REFERENCES

Andrulis, D. P. "Black Professionals in Predominately White Institutions o. Higher Education: An Examination of Some Demographic and Mobility Characteristics." *Journal of Negro Education*, Winter, 1976, vol. 44.

Bowles, F. & DeCosta, F. A. *Between Two Worlds: A Profile of Negro Higher Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *From Isolation to Mainstream.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Federal Register. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, Vol. 40, No. 107.

Ford, H. "Need for Negro Colleges: Address, November 1, 1973." *Vital Speeches of Today*, December 15, 1973, vol. 40.

Green, E. and Winstead, P. C. "Systematic Institutional Planning." *Educational Technology*, July, 1975.

Holsey, L. H. *Sermons, Addresses and Essays.* Atlanta, Georgia, 1898.

McGrath, E. J. *The Predominately Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.

Morris, E. W. "Contemporary Negro College and the Brain Drain." *Journal of Negro Education*, Fall, 1972, Vol. 41.

Phifer, A. *The Higher Education of Blacks in the United States.* A Reprint of the Alfred and Winifred Hoemle Memorial Lecture, 1973.

A Report of Federal Support for Black Colleges. Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation, 1972.

Rivers, A. A. "Predominately Black Colleges: A National Resource." *Journal of the National Association of College Admission Counselors*, March, 1975, Vol. 19.

Rivlin, A. M. *The Role of the Federal Government in Financing Higher Education.* The Brookings Institution, 1961.

Sasscer, H. *New Prospects for Achievement. Federal Programs for Colleges and Universities.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1964.

Thompson, D. C. *Private Black Colleges at the Crossroads.* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1973.

ED170410

The Black Protest Tradition of Historically Black Colleges: A Comparative Analysis of Historically Black and Historically White Institutions

BY ELIAS BLAKE, JR., *President of Clark College*

THE predicates for policies that govern the orders of the court must rest in the fact that black Americans in the specific states for the order and in the region and the Nation are still grossly unequal in their education. They are also unequal in all those background factors which produce students who voluntarily seek higher education.

The decision as to whom shall be given access to college and higher education is not made in a social vacuum within our present society. The higher educational system virtually determines societal mobility, that is, entry into the middle and upper level positions in the occupational hierarchy. It is the higher educational system that has become the manipulator and grantor of privilege in our contemporary society. As long as the higher educational system determines entry into the occupational structure, it thereby controls the manner in which the society distributes its rewards.

The rewards come with completion of the course not simple enrollment. The barriers to completion are greater and more difficult to overcome than the barriers to access. While enrollment grows, completions do not. This has happened to black Americans. From 1960 to 1974, enrollment increased from 234,000 to 677,000. For the statistics on completion, the gap between the races actually widened from 7.8% to 12.9%.* For black Americans, the burden of their history is still a factor in their contemporary and future prospects in education. We cannot gloss over the fact that state actions were and still are a major factor in visiting upon black education inequities that have still not been overcome. What Frederick Douglas wrote nearly a century ago still obtains about the black American:

> He has ceased to be the slave of an individual, but has in some sense become the slave of society. He may not be bought and sold like a beast in the market, but he is the trammeled victim of a prejudice, well calculated to repress his manly ambition, paralyze his energies, and make him a dejected and spiritless man, if not a sullen enemy to society, fit to prey upon life and property and to make trouble generally. Today the black is protected by a host of civil rights laws. But forces of discrimination are still wrong.

The forces of discrimination have been particularly strong in institutions of higher education in America. This cannot be ignored as we embark on making the institutions dominated by white educators more responsive to the needs of black students. It cannot be ignored that this, therefore, will be a long and protracted struggle to make educators do by law what they refused to do for decades for reasons of morality or justice or fairness.

New traditions and customs must be successfully forged for black *education* versus enrollment to take place on a massive scale in historically white institutions. The history of the racism of which Frederick Douglas spoke was heavily embedded in universities and colleges until less than a decade ago. Allan Ballard in his book *The Education of Black Folk* indicates:

> Nothing reveals the direct connection between American higher education and the operating principles of American society more than the record of white universities in regard to the black question over the one-hundred-year time span between Emancipation and the beginning of open admission efforts in the

*In 1960, 4.1% of blacks and 11.9% of whites had four or more years of college in 1960, a gap of 7.8%. In 1974, 8.1% of blacks and 21.0% of whites had four or more years of college for a gap of 12.9%. In the 15 years, blacks have fallen further behind whites in completion of college.

UD019361

mid-1960's. There can be no charitable explanation for the almost total exclusion of blacks from the faculties, student bodies, and curricula of these colleges.

In the South public and private schools shared in the exclusions, and long after 1954 only a handful of black students were on the university campuses. Even private, Christian institutions under no compulsion to exclude blacks, did not move aggressively. Therefore, it was more than a legal sanction at work, but an agreement with the practices of racial segregation by faculties and administrators. Dr. Ballard continues:

By active recruitment of black students, they could have created a situation in which black professionals of every order—doctors, lawyers, physicists—would have been at least proportional to the numbers of blacks in the population at large. They could have brought black faculty into their colleges in numbers sufficient to have created the image of integrated faculties at the very center of the culture of American civilization.... Finally, they could have sent forth to their students and to the school systems of this country a steady and unswerving message that black people are human. The universities, of course, did none of these things.

Dr. Ballard goes on to document how leading university scholars in history and literature were apologists for white supremacy and even justified violence against blacks:

In their *A Short History of the United States*, Allan Nevins of Columbia University and Henry Steele Commager of Amherst were to say of the Reconstruction period: ... 'The governments established by the blacks were probably the worst that have ever been known in any English-speaking land. The poor downtrodden white Southerner was in despair—but not for long. Little by little the self-respecting whites of the region gained the right of ruling themselves. In part they did this by violence and intimidation. They set up the Ku Klux Klan which compelled many carpetbaggers to return to the North and frightened Negroes away from the voting places.'

One can add the names of eminent historians, William A. Dunning, John Burgess, and Albert Bushell Hart, as reporting similar interpretations. Dr. Ballard continues:

In 1930 literary counterparts of the social scientist and historians, Allen Tate, Donald Davidson, and Robert Penn Warren, in collaboration with others, wrote a defense of segregation and a celebration of the 'remarkable society.' Robert Penn Warren said: 'In the past, the Southern Negro has always been a creature of the small town and farm. That is where he still chiefly belongs by temperament and the status of a human being who is likely to find in agricultural and domestic pursuits the happiness that his good nature and easy ways incline him to as an ordinary function of his being'. Donald Davidson, professor of English at Vanderbilt University from 1920 to 1937, another of the authors, declared in a panegyric to rural Georgia: 'Lynchings, the work of hotheads and roustabouts, were regrettable, *but what did a few lynchings count* [author emphasis] in the balance against the continual forbearance and solicitude that the Georgian felt he exercised towards these amiable children of cannibals.'

The model universities of highest prestige in America had scholarly justifiers for the use of Jim Crow and segregation in the South. Given the power and influence of these institutions, it is clear that deep in the consciousness of university builders in the South, these traditions were "honorable." That the universities were no different from the society at large is not surprising when one sees the views of Thomas Jefferson, one of the founders of the University of Virginia and of America, a man who opposed slavery as did Lincoln, but considered black men barely human.

Comparing them by their faculties of memory, reason, and imagination, it appears to me, that in memory they are equal to the whites; reason much inferior, as I think one could scarcely be found capable of tracing and comprehending the investigations of Euclid; and that in imagination they are dull, tasteless, and anomalous.... Some have been liberally educated, and all have lived in countries where the arts and sciences are cultivated to a considerable degree, and have had before their eyes samples of the best works from abroad.... But never yet could I find that a black had uttered a thought above the level of plain narration; never seen even an elementary trial of painting or sculpture.[1]

[1]Winthrop D. Jordan, *White Over Black* (The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1968) p. 436-437.

Jefferson's ideas, not atypical, were later picked up by the social "sciences" of psychology and sociology. In 1916, George Oscar Ferguson's work at the University of Virginia in early I.Q. studies was used by Herman R. Branson in his *Blacks and Science*. He points out that Ferguson: "Set the pattern in generalizing far beyond the data. His data were interpreted to show that the average I.Q. of whites was 100 and that of blacks only 75. Later he modified his conclusions to reflect a new experiment: 69.27% for pure Negroes; 73.2% for 75% Negroes; 81.2% for mulattoes (half-whites); 98.7% for quadroons; with whites at 100%. His editorializing led him to such explanatory contributions that the black's mental development ceased at puberty."

Ferguson's work was similar to that of Stanley Hall, one of the founders of this discipline in America. Michael Winston cites the following about Hall:

> Among the distinguished social science professors was Stanley Hall, who held the first Ph.D. in psychology in the United States, and made an academic reputation as the founder of the psychology laboratory at Johns Hopkins (1883) and the American Journal of Psychology (1887). Hall used his academic authority in support of anti-Negro propaganda while he was president of Clark University (1899-1919). In 1905, his article "A Few Results of Recent Scientific Study of the Negro in America" noted that a 'new scientific study of the Negro has arisen, and is fast developing established results which are slowing placing the problems of the future of this race upon a more solid and intelligent basis, and which seem destined sooner or later to condition philanthropy and legislation, make sentiment more intelligent and ...' What were these research findings which were to 'condition philanthropy and legislation?' First, that 'color of the skin and crookedness of the hair are only the outward signs of many far deeper differences, including cranial and thoracic capacity, proportions of body, nervous system, glands and secretions, vita sexualis, food, temperament, disposition, character, longevity, instincts, customs, emotional traits, and diseases.'

Hall continued:

> During slavery regular hard work, temperance, awe of his white masters, were potent restraints.... Now idleness, drink and a new sense of equality have destroyed these restraints of imperious lust, which in some cases is reinforced by the thought of generations of abuse of his own women by white men upon whom he would turn the tables. At any rate, the number, boldness, and barbarity of rapists, and the frequency of the murder of their victims have increased till whites in many parts of the South have told me that no woman of their race is safe anywhere alone day or night.... As a preventative of crime, lynching has something to be said for it, but more to be said against it! This wild justice is brutalizing upon those who inflict it.

In sociology one of the leaders Winston points out is Howard W. Odum whose "Social and Mental Traits of the Negro: A Study in Race Traits, Tendencies and Prospects," was published in 1910 as volume 37 of the *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*, edited by the faculty of political science of Columbia University. Odum, president of the American Sociology Society in 1930, and editor of *Social Forces*, 1922-1954, was one of the most influential southern liberals in academic life, serving as Kenan Professor and head of the Sociology Department at the University of North Carolina, and director of the Institute for Research in Social Science. In recognition of his work Harvard conferred upon him an LL.D. in 1939. Odum believed in the "proper education of the race to its genetic tendencies," which is worth quoting at length because it represents the opinion of probably the majority of American social scientists well into the 1930's and 1940's. "Inherited tendency," he said,

> and environment of the race conditions constitute a powerful influence in the education of the Negro child.... Back of the child, and affecting him both directly and indirectly, are the characteristics of the race. The Negro has little home conscience or love of home, no local attachment of the better sort.... He has no pride of ancestry, and he is not influenced by the lives of great men. The Negro has few ideals and perhaps no lasting adherence to an aspiration toward real worth. He has little conception of the meaning of virtue, truth, honor, manhood, integrity. He is shiftless, untidy and indolent.... The Negro is improvident and extravagant, lazy rather than industrious, faithful in the performance of certain duties, without vindictiveness, he yet has a reasonable amount of physical

> endurance. But he lacks initiative; he is often dishonest and untruthful. He is overreligious and superstitious. The Negro suspects his own race and the white race as well; his mind does not conceive of faith in humanity—he does not comprehend it.... One of the crying weaknesses of the Negro school is the lack of moral strength on the part of the women teachers. It is but natural that children accustomed to gross immoralities at home and sometimes seeing indications of the same tendency on the part of the teachers, should be greatly affected by it at school. Thus with mental stupidity and moral insensibility back of them the children are affected already in practice and thought, in deeds and in speech.

The impact of such eminences was and is incalculable on shaping the general public's view of black Americans and their education, a public out of which later generations of academic men were to come forth into universities. Organized academe was also rather racist in its national organizations as reported by Winston.

> In 1939 when Rayford W. Logan was president of the Howard University chapter of the American Association of University Professors, he wrote to the national office of the AAUP to inquire about the accommodations for Howard professors at the Association's annual meeting held that year in New Orleans. Ralph Himstead, executive secretary of the AAUP, replied that the Negro members of Howard's chapter would be permitted to attend the meeting, but of course they could not be guests at the hotel and would have to enter through the back door.

Blacks were similarly not admitted to Phi Beta Kappa affairs held in Washington, D.C., the nation's capital, though they were members based on the small numbers of blacks who graduate from New England colleges. In the South, the Southern Association of Colleges and schools which controlled "standards" for accreditations did not allow blacks into their meetings as full fledged members until 1961, and then only after years of pressure and negotiations from black educators. The segregated hotels could have been avoided by holding meetings at larger private university campuses. No such efforts were reported.

In contemporary times the issues are more subtle but institutions with the traditions outlined above are not free of the vestiges of their history. The work of Arthur Jensen of the University of California at Berkeley, Richard Hernstein and William Shockley on the *Genetic Inferiority of Blacks* still encourages bitter debate. The weight of the academy in the present is set against their work. Yet, their work has been so widely publicized by the media that the question of black intellectual inferiority has opened again for debate! It is indeed remarkable that academe still views the supposed racial inferiority of blacks as a scientific and not a political issue.

It is indeed remarkable that academe still views potential "scientific" verification of the mental inferiority of blacks as legitimate research. The Jensen work became so persuasive that a series of hearings in the U.S. Senate were held by Senator Walter Mondale, entitled "Environment, Intelligence and Scholastic Achievement." It produced almost 900 pages of words on the issue of the mental equality of black Americans. Most of it supported the contention of equality, but it is frightening to think of the need in the 1970's to defend against such an issue at such length in complicated logical and often mathematically-laden treatises. It is still necessary to have the verdict of "science" to pronounce blacks equal to whites as men.

The tradition of social "science" and academic "scholarship" sees Arthur Jensen inducted as a fellow in the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1977. This status must be voted. This means a majority of his peers in 1977 in science agree that his work on the potential inferiority of black minds is of scientific merit. That this can happen despite the 350-year treatment of blacks is still absolutely chilling in what it portends for institutions where black intelligence clearly is an open question!!

To deal scientifically with whether blacks and whites are equal, a rather long term experiment is needed. It would begin with a

significant group of African countries raiding the eastern coastal regions of America for white slaves. About ten million would be transported to Africa, enslaved for 250 years in an alien culture, their family religion and language constantly suppressed. After being freed these whites would then be allowed limited access to African life and segregated by neighborhoods and kept in menial jobs and given limited schooling for another 100 years.

African social scientists would give some of these white children tests to measure their innate intelligence. The tests, however, depend on reading and writing, which are acquired skills in the special schools that Africans allow whites to attend. The Africans would then conclude that whites are inferior mentally to Africans. Some cross-cultural studies could then determine the relative impact on blacks in America and whites in Africa.

Given the historic evolution of social science in America and its checkered history on racial questions, it is not surprising that blacks cannot get their white colleagues to understand their perspectives on these issues. One, therefore, sees the historical traditions still are cropping up, despite a great deal of liberal rhetoric that does not reflect the views of a potential silent majority in academe. A silent majority that has no enthusiasm for supporting black progress.

The current research on the internal functioning of historically white universities, as reported by black faculty and students, reinforces the possibility that a silent majority may, indeed, exist. The major study by William Moore, *Black Educators in White Colleges*, was a national survey of the experiences of black educators. He reports:

> Many of the debilitating practices of society have spilled over into the academy; blacks, even in this rarefied environment, are victimized. More than 62 percent of our respondents in four-year institutions and 56 percent in two-year institutions experience bigotry from their white colleagues on a scale from moderately serious to very serious. They seem not to have this problem with white students, who have little reluctance to accept and interact with black professionals. It seems that those who have come to be taught must do the teaching. . . . There is paternalism, that ogre of white mentality which blots out rational thinking about nonwhites and assigns them child-like qualities for which someone white must accept responsibility; there are efforts to limit black contact with white persons of the other sex. All of these things occur with discomforting regularity. Beyond this, our respondents say most of their white colleagues do not support efforts to change negative views about blacks, particularly when the efforts are initiated by blacks.

Another study in the 1970's reported similar responses from black students as reported by Charles V. Willie in *Black Students of White Colleges.*

> Probably one of the greatest differentiators between black and white students with reference to their instructors, as we have noted, is the lack of trust that black students have in white teachers. This is indicated by the fact that only 36 percent of the black students believe that the teacher is the appropriate person with whom to register a complaint about an academic problem like grades, compared with a majority (59 percent) of the white students. These data strongly suggest then that black students at white colleges are less trusting of, and comfortable with, the faculty than are white students.
>
> A frequent complaint of black students is that white teachers ignore them. Other complaints are that white teachers do not comprehend the black experience and discourage black students from discussing and researching their racial heritage as an educational exercise. A few complaints charge outright discrimination.

In *Desegregating American Colleges,* a nationwide survey of black students set up by the Daniel Yankelovich Polling group which has shown great accuracy in predicting election results, William Boyd found that the more blacks enrolled on a campus, the greater the percentage reporting racial discrimination and that the colleges "did not" care about blacks or were "negative in responsiveness to black students" (p. 27-28)—50% reporting outright discrimination while 68% and 65% reported not being cared about. Boyd describes the students' situation:

> The types of discrimination cited by black students . . . quite varied, but there are some recurring themes. The major problems between black students and faculty members involve assumptions about black students, and remarks to or about blacks. Many black students feel that professors view them as incompetents. For example, a student said a professor "told me I would probably need special help without knowing me or my abilities." The students feel that this injects self-fulfilling prophecy, if not outright inequality, into the grading process. Grades then tend to be lower than performance would indicate.
>
> Students also criticize a tendency to assume they are dishonest. Examples given include refusing to let black students sit together during exams and questioning whether black students actually wrote term papers they submitted merely because the papers were outstanding. Other faculty behavior which is criticized includes being accessible outside class only to white students, accusing black students who seek additional help of wanting "handouts" or "everything on a silver platter," and ignoring or slighting black students in class. Finally, there are two types of behavior which are all too familiar: calling white students "Mr." or "Miss" but using the first names of black students, and "expecting blacks to have all the answers to racial problems or feeling that [they] are completely stupid."
>
> In referring to discrimination from people other than faculty members, black students distinguish overt from subtle types. Overt discrimination includes such things as calling them "niggers," refusing to cash checks or money orders, "vulgar remarks about white men and black women," criticizing blacks for behavior while ignoring the same behavior by whites, and refusing to accept assignments of a black roommate or lab partner.
>
> Subtle discrimination does not involve direct confrontation or exchange, but concerns such things as the college newspaper not covering black events, administrators giving students the runaround rather than the help they need, not enough counseling, "coldness and condescension," and "a general attitude of white supremacy." As one student summarized the situation, the problem is "disrespect twenty-four hours a day."

The traditions and current practices do not lead to less but to greater pressure on white universities to do what is right and just. It will be a long and protracted struggle even with the strong court orders we badly need. In that protracted struggle, the role of historically black colleges and their traditions will be absolutely critical if the long term goals of equality are to be achieved.

Another quote from Howard Odum acts as an indication of the sharply different tradition of black colleges. Odum says about the work of Negro colleges in the first quarter of this century:

> The young educated Negroes are not a force for good in the community but for evil. The Negro quickly outgrows the influence and control of his instructors; especially has this been noted in cases where the [northern] whites have taught them. . . . They imitate the whites and believe themselves thereby similar to them.

Odum was correct. Historically black colleges were in the words of C. Eric Lincoln:

> Born of the turmoil of a war which made black men free with an imperfect freedom, established in a social environment hostile to its presence and committed to its destruction, the Negro college has survived to become one of the singular assets of the black community and a unique, valuable, contributing component in the educational complex of America. More than that, it is an instrument of freedom. Black freedom. The vision of the men and women who founded this institution which is now a vital aspect of the black heritage, the wise and often sacrificial leadership which nurtured its infancy and guided its development, was informed by their faith in the righteousness of God and by their confidence in the social potential of the black American.

A 1910 survey of graduates of black colleges as reported in "The College-Bred Negro," an Atlanta University publication, shows the impact of the tradition in these quotes from the graduates:

> The Negro must work and fight and fight and work. He must scorn peace earned at the price of self-respect. He must deport himself as a man, and he must insist on being treated as a man in America.
>
> The Negro is growing more assertive and manly. He is beginning to meet imposition with opposition, even with his own life.
>
> The Negro needs leaders and instructors who will teach that he is a man.

Samuel Nabrit, former member of the Atomic Energy Commission, President of Texas Southern, and an eminent biological researcher indicated that:

> The Negro colleges have been practicall, the sole source of higher educational opportunities for Negroes for most of a century. They have also been the birthplaces of significant liberation movements: W.E.B. DuBois, the Niagara Movement; the NAACP; the legal battles leading to the 1954 court decision in school cases; and the student sit-ins of the mid-sixties. These institutions, in addition, have been history-in-the-making for the Negro and remain his cultural reservoirs. They have taught him that he is somebody, which is antithetical to the teachings of his outside social environment. These institutions have provided role models for raising his aspirations.

The scholarly journals from the historically black colleges were fighters of racism and segregation.

Winston cites the work of the *Journal of Negro Education*, founded at Howard University, as the prime organ of black scholars in black colleges. The journal produced the:

> . . . most potent continuing critique of the public policy of segregation. An early emphasis was on highlighting the inequities in support of white and Negro education, which worsened in the first third of the twentieth century, and did not begin to improve until the legal challenges of the 1930's. But the most significant contribution is the Journal which included comprehensive studies of a wide range of problems related to Negro life (volume 8, on the Position of the Negro in American Social Order, is a particularly distinguished example). For many years the Journal was the best single source of information about the status of segregated schools and shifts in the legal strategies adopted to destroy segregation, and it was common for the Journal to publish articles like "The Present Status of the Negro Separate School as Defined by Court Decisions" or "Types of Potentially Favorable Court Cases Relative to the Separate School." [It] also published a steady stream of research by Howard H. Long and Martin D. Jenkins and others on the question of the intelligence of Negroes and on intelligence testing which exposed the distortions of white educators.

Contributors to the *Journal of Negro Education* were and still are on the faculties of black schools or blacks from white schools. This tradition of criticism continues to the present and will be unyielding in its attacks on racism and discrimination.

In the same period that the Dunnings, Odum, and others were justifying white supremacy, scholars from the black colleges were trying to set the record straight. Winston (p. 698-699) points out:

> Works by Negro scholars providing a corrective to the dominant view began to increase steadily. A few examples are *Negro Labor in the United States*, 1850-1925 (1927) and *The Collapse of the Confederacy (1938) by Charles H. Wesley (at Howard, 1913-1942); The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Haiti, 1776-1891* (1941), *The African Mandates in World Politics* (1948) and *The Negro in American Life and Thought: The Nadir, 1877-1901* (1954) by Rayford W. Logan (at Virginia Union, 1925-1930; Atlanta, 1933-1935; and Howard since 1938); *The Negro in the Civil War* (1953), *The Negro in the American Revolution* (1961), and *Lincoln and the Negro* (1962) by Benjamin Quarles (at Dillard University, 1939-1953; Morgan State College since 1953); *The Free Negro in North Carolina* (1943), *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of American Negroes* (1947), and *The Militant South, 1800-1861* (1956) by John Hope Franklin (at Fisk, 1936-1937; St. Augustine's College, 1939-1943; North Carolina College for Negroes, 1943-1947; Howard University 1947-1956; Brooklyn College, 1956-1964; and the University of Chicago since 1964). Wesley, Logan, Quarles and Franklin have been the best known of the Negro historians.

Martin Jenkins, and Charles H. Wesley became presidents of public black colleges and remained champions of racial equality. Within the public and private black colleges the traditions of supporting equality despite segregation continued. Some commentators were not surprised at the rise of the sit-in, freedom ride and voter registration activism of students in black colleges in the early 1960's. Blake observed:

> The movement was a symbol and in a sense a culmination of the conflict between the principles of equality supported by teachers (in black colleges) and the still segregated southern society. The sit-ins, freedom rides and picket lines were aimed at the

continuing segregation in restaurants, movie theaters, bus and railroad stations, hotels and motels, public parks, public libraries, golf courses, beaches, and swimming pools. The 1954 decision on education left all this intact. It is fair to say that a major if not dominant force in this movement were students from black colleges. As this period evolved, there were even armed attacks at no less than six college campuses by police of the National Guard. There were a small number (4) of fatalities to students. . . .

NAFEO, which sponsors the conference, stated in a document in November of 1975* that:

Their inner values and missions flow out of the black experience in America which has a dominant theme, the removal of all racial barriers. . . . These institutions almost alone have fought to be open to all. From their inception they have been and still are leaders in openness to interracial cooperation in their faculties and student bodies. . . . They must always take exception with those who would set up artificial barriers based on race and class. They must organize themselves to accept students whose education prior to college was unequal to that of the average American student. . . . They have legitimized culture and nurtured black creativity and scholarship during times when the nation's interest was other directed. . . . In short, there are some leadership roles in equalizing equality of educational opportunity that have not been, are not being, and will not be filled by historically white institutions. If, in the evolutionary process, all historically black institutions became just like historically white institutions, their dominant mission would no longer be to press heavily for equal opportunity and attainment for blacks. Such a situation would threaten racial progress for the nation. Without these institutions, there is no uncompromising cutting edge for attainment as well as opportunity.

Charles Lyons, the president of that Association, indicated in 1976**

Legal attacks on the efforts to admit blacks to graduate and professional schools are increasing in volume under the labels of reverse discrimination and preferential treatment. These attacks are supported by more and more so-called scholars from prestigious universities.

Legal attacks on desegregation in higher education in the South, rather than dealing with historic white institutions, have turned their primary attention to the black colleges. The mood seems to be that if we could just solve the problem of the black colleges everything would be fine. This diverts attention from the fact that black colleges have uplifted black education when white institutions were not even interested. The black colleges are not the problem but can be an important part of the solution.

This leading black educator went on to say:

There appears to be now developing a national higher education tracking system much like the old academic vs. vocational or business curricula in the high schools. It tracks the poor and the black disproportionately into something new called post-secondary education. It tracks the middle and upper income groups into traditional higher education. If its formation is not stopped, it can delay for generations our movement toward equality.

The historic traditions of black colleges, then, continue into the contemporary world and define why these colleges are essential to racial progress and black equality. Their future cannot be considered in the myopic framework of how many students out of the national enrollment data are enrolled in black colleges. They are the instrument that insures that educational progress for blacks takes no disastrous turns. Their roles, then, are compensatory in terms of the continuing default of American higher education to be more responsive. There are five aspects to their compensatory role:

1) to compensate for the lack of *full-time, long-term* national leadership that cannot be diverted from the issues of racism and discrimination in American education.

2) to compensate for the lack of good scholarship on black American life by being a source of criticism and counter attacks on the apologists for continued black exclusion.

3) to compensate for the large numbers of black students who would be without opportunities and who would not fulfill their aspirations because of educational neglect or non-caring for their full human potential.

4) to compensate for the underproductivity of American higher education in the production of graduates *versus just enrollees.* 80% of the black

*A Year 2000 Plan for Parity in Education, November, 1975—*NAFEO.*

**1976 keynote address: NAFEO First National Conference on Blacks in Higher Education.

graduates in the South (and 50% of those nationally) come from black colleges.

5) to compensate for the inability of American higher education to develop new definitions of excellence for individuals and institutions that are inclusive of black-Americans.

With these organizing principles in mind for setting public policy about historically black colleges, some concrete proposals will be put forward:

1) The Carter administration should review seriously the following recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on higher education about black colleges. These recommendations were designed to enable these institutions to reach a 300,000 enrollment by 1985 with none having an enrollment smaller than 1,000.
   a. reaching a target of $356,000,000 *a year* in institutional grants and student financial aid. This figure excludes categorical aid in research and training programs across all the federal agencies. The totals were approximately 188 million dollars in student assistance and 168 million dollars in institutional assistance. In construction grants 25 million dollars and 25 million dollars in loans. Cost of education allowances 52.5 million and library assistance 5 million dollars, and developing institutions 6.0 million. (Developing institutions total 110 million with 84 million for 4 year schools and 26 million for 2 year schools.)
   b. create a federal mechanism to plan a program of long-term aid to colleges and universities founded for black Americans. It would coordinate the funding package recommended ab[illegible] as well as suggest strategies for how other federal agencies such as NSF, HUD, and USDA can add to their categorical aid to black colleges. This mechanism can devote attention to the general needs of blacks in higher education because of their more complex institutional distributions. It is much more difficult to insure that institutional funding gets to the target groups in historically white institutions.
   c. provide financing for two or more regional centers for research on education for black Americans. This recommendation is expanded to 4 or more centers in black colleges that include research on continuing education for adults and articulation between post-secondary education and higher education for black Americans. Many blacks that did not go on to college immediately from high school or that are in community colleges are needed in baccalaureate programs for blacks to catch up to white Americans. Elementary and secondary issues would be covered in the context of pathways to equity in professions requiring higher education.

   As policies are reviewed on Research and Development in education by the National Institute on Education, these new efforts can be planned and executed.

It is clear from the last decade that support for historically black institutions from other sectors has been uncertain and short-term. The private sector—foundations, corporations and wealthy individuals—and the states have shown no enthusiasm for developing the funding base for much larger, much more diverse curricula and much stronger historically black colleges.

The Federal government, therefore, must revert to the historic policy posture represented in the short life of the Freedman's Bureau. That policy posture recognized that the enslavement of blacks was a result of national policies and required, therefore, a Federal response. The continuing problems of inequality in education are still long-term results of national policies which were silent on segregation until 1954, and effective until the mid-1960's, produced public accommodations, voting rights and civil rights laws. Those laws are incontrovertible proof of the special Federal responsibility. Additional ways in which this Federal responsibility must be expressed are as follows:

1) Use of its responsibility for statewide planning under the Adams vs. Mathews desegregation to actualize the meaning of the U.S. Court of Appeals ruling which stated that statewide planning was to:

   provide more and better trained minority group doctors, lawyers, engineers and other professionals. A predicate for minority access to quality post-graduate programs is a viable, coordinated statewide higher education policy that takes into account the special problems of minority students and black colleges. As Amicus points out, these black institutions currently fulfill a crucial need and will continue to play an important role in black higher education.

By keeping before the states the need to deal with the *production of educated manpower,* the Federal government avoids a focus on the percentage of whites and blacks in each institution that obscures the educational needs of blacks in the states. If this is not done it will be forgotten that desegregation is a strategy to bring *more* and *better* education to blacks. As a tool, desegregation has no inherent merit except that it is being productive of a higher quality and quantity of education for blacks.

In higher education that means more baccalaureate graduates, more doctors, lawyers, Ph.D.'s, pharmacists, and engineers as the Appeals Court dictated.

2) Develop a national strategy for equity in higher education which recognizes that black Americans will need at least a decade of "Bonus Years." These are years in which the proportion of blacks enrolled in four-year colleges and graduate and professional schools *exceeds* their proportions in the population. The numbers graduating will also exceed their population proportions. This national strategy is dictated by the fact that black Americans are falling behind in completing four or more years of college in the youngest age group 25 to 34 year olds. (Four or more years include graduate and professional school graduates.)

   The Federal government must create an expansionary basis for such a program of equity or assist institutions to substitute larger numbers of blacks for declining white enrollment, if it occurs as widely predicted. The bonus years are possible if:

   a) the historically black colleges do expand to a minimum of 300,000 in 1985 and some more of them acquire a capacity for graduate and professional education or the existing capacity in law, medicine and pharmacy, for example, is doubled.

   b) a nationally devised strategy to generate a more significant number of blacks who are enrolling in community colleges through them and into four year colleges and universities. The federal planning mechanism can estimate what percentage of blacks must move to completion of baccalaureates and graduate and professional schools to achieve equity. A national strategy to hook together the capacity of black colleges, especially private black colleges and a flow of blacks from community colleges into them, will be a significant factor. If such a national network is established, the enrollment in historically black colleges may exceed 300,000 by 1985. It is desirable that they do this as a part of the "Bonus Years" strategy.

   c) Federal leadership is given for the two regional areas where blacks are concentrated. Federal financing for inter-state compacts or cooperative networks is a must. One of the most important factors depressing the growth of some public black colleges, for example, is a ceiling on out of state enrollment. Some institutions here had as much as a 35% out of state enrollment in an undergraduate population. This is symptomatic of blacks seeking opportunity where they know it exists. Much of that enrollment comes from the North and West.

Annual Percentage Changes in Grand Total Enrollment for 98 Historically Black Colleges:* 1966-1976

Control	Level	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75+	1975-76
Public	Four Year	5.5	5.7	5.9	5.3	6.9	2.1	2.8	0.9	13.3	−0.6
	Two Year	6.8	−7.5	26.1	10.2	3.1	9.4	5.6	15.0	9.7	11.7
	Total	5.5	5.4	6.4	5.4	6.8	2.4	2.9	1.3	13.2	−0.3
Private	Four Year	8.9	3.0	−0.2	0.7	3.4	0.6	−0.8	4.2	7.6	2.4
	Two Year	−3.2	−4.0	−3.7	4.1	3.1	−6.1	−8.1	−1.7	−8.7**	−0.1
	Total	8.2	2.6	−0.4	0.9	3.4	0.2	−1.2	3.9	7.0	2.4
	Grand Total	6.4	4.5	4.3	4.1	5.8	1.8	1.8	2.0	11.5	0.4

*Previously studied in "Degrees Granted and Enrollment Trends in Historically Black Colleges; an Eight Year Study"
+One small two-year private school is closed: thus N=97 for 1974-76.
**Significant decrease is due to temporary school closing.

In terms of regional distributions of blacks in public school, we find in the Office of Civil Rights Data for 1970:

—57% (3.8 million) in the southern and border states.

—43% (2.9 million) in the rest of the country, but 86% of this 43% in 8 states (2.5 of 2.9 million) in rank order:

1. New York	542,000
2. Illinois	421,000
3. California	417,000
4. Ohio	295,000
5. Michigan	288,000
6. Pennsylvania	275,000
7. New Jersey	225,000
8. Indiana	109,000

—The 1970 Census verified the regional breakdown with 54% of the high school enrollment in the South (excluding Missouri)*

The higher education implications are that 55 to 60 percent of the potential future higher education enrollment is in the southern and border states where traditionally black colleges still carry the heaviest load of higher education for blacks.

A profile of the current enterprise is in order:

Chart I
Enrollment 1975

Type of Institution	Control	Total Headcount	First-time Freshmen
Four-Year and University	Public	147,761	34,238
	Private	53,159	15,547
	Total	200,920	49,785
Two-Year	Public	7,379	2,853
	Private	3,067	1,583
	Total	10,446	4,436
	Grand Total	211,366	54,221

Chart II
Degrees—1973

Baccalaureates	25,094
Biological Science	3.5%
Business Management	15.1%
Education (Teaching)	33.4%
Physical Sciences	1.6%
Social Sciences	19.6%
Other	26.8%
Masters	5,545
Ph.D.'s	43
Medicine	173
Dentistry	128
Law	259

Baccalaureates
(white colleges) 23,000 (Est) Need—115,000*

*As 12% of 958,000 baccalaureates awarded, blacks are 12% of the college going age groups. They should have received 115,000 degrees when the maximum was about 50,000.

Lest an illusion be created, the current situation in terms of participation in the professions for blacks must be viewed. Blacks were 9.5% of the work force in America in 1973 (8,061,000 black; 75,278,000 white; 83,339,800 Total). In the professional and technical areas requiring higher education we see a consistent pattern of deficits.

All professional and technical		5.7% Blacks
Engineers	15,000	1.4%
Teachers except college	253,000	8.7%
Other areas	291,000	5.0%

At the other end of the continuum we see the following which require minimal education.

Laborers—		
Construction	178,000	20.8%
Manufacturing	230,000	20.9%
Private Household	509,000	37.6%
Cleaning Services	577,000	27.8%
Health Services	352,000	22.1%

Among professions requiring graduate and professional training.

Physicians	2.0%
Dentists	2.5%
Lawyers	1.5%
Ph.D.'s	2.0%

These figures, as low as they are, are primarily based on the contribution of black colleges to the training and development of a professional class. The contributions of the white universities are just beginning to show an impact on the early 1970's. Prior to that as late as 1968 eight of ten baccalaureates were still coming from black colleges. In 1973, 60% of the black Ph.D. graduates took their baccalaureates in black colleges. (760 of 33,727 for 2.25% of the total.)

One can conclude from these patterns and the major deficit that no significant national commitment to the higher education of black Americans existed prior to 1968. The reaction of black students on white campuses to the assassination of Martin Luther King coupled with the most widespread racial riots, even in the broader society shocked white colleges into recruiting and admitting more black students.

The strength of those commitments are being tested in 1977. Economic depression, inflation and a naiveté about the magnitude of the task, undercut the commitments in a great many places. The distribution of enrollment in 1974 was as follows:

386,000	4 year colleges and universities
291,000	2 year colleges and universities
687,000	Total
190,000	black colleges (included in 687,000)

ED170411

A Prime Assignment for Black Colleges: Role of Blacks in the Sciences and Related Fields

BY HERMAN BRANSON, *President of Lincoln University*

IN the publisher's introduction of the 1944 book, *What the Negro Wants*, W.T. Couch, whose fame rested upon his germinal book, *Culture in the South*, inveighed against the misuse of "science" in denying full justice to the Negro. Thirty years later we still tread that same terrain, resisting what Raymond Aron calls the pseudo-science of the semi-intellectuals. Yet, the question of what the black wants from science is much larger than the issue of the selective use of supposedly scientific data to emphasize the inferiority of blacks, for it rests upon a broader perspective of the role of science in the modern world and the responsibility, nay necessity, for any definable group of people to insure that they are represented in basic decision-making about our world. Thus, this position makes the argument of economic gain almost secondary, although the good jobs in our society are held by people technically trained either in the natural or social sciences.

We can be quite specific and state that it seems reasonable that the treatment of blacks as objects in scientific research could be a great motivational stimulus to young blacks, so that here they may find a theme that could make their lives significant, that might convince them that it matters what they do with their lives. And anger and revulsion with the past could be positive stimuli for high application. Still, we should attempt to move our focus from those fields which study man—the social sciences, plus anthropology, genetics, psychology—to those scientific fields where the concern is the good life for man amidst the physical environment—the physical sciences and engineering, the biological sciences and medicine. To be sure, we must hold out the prospect that the social system could profit from an application of the methods, procedures, constructs—the rationale—of scientific inquiry to social problems.

Blacks as Objects of Scientific Study

Thomas Jefferson had received a manuscript copy of the Maryland Almanac that Benjamin Banneker had written, so he wrote to reveal his feelings in a letter to Banneker dated August 30, 1791:

> Nobody wishes more than I do to see such proofs as you exhibit, that nature has given to our black brethren, talents equal to those of the other colors of men, and that the appearance of a want of them is owing merely to the degraded condition of their existence.... I can add with truth, that nobody wishes more ardently to see a good system commenced for raising the condition both of their body and mind to what it ought to be ...

Jefferson's opinion was unquestionably the most liberal of any learned person of his day. Later he went even further in a letter to the Marquis de Condorcet:

> I am happy to be able to inform you that we have now in the United States a negro, the son of a black man born in Africa, and a black woman born in the United States, who is a very respectable mathematician. I procured him to be employed under one of our chief directors in laying out the new federal city on the Potowmack, and in the intervals of his leisure, while on that work, he made an Almanac for the next year, which he sent me in his own hand writing, and which I inclose to you. I have seen very elegant solutions of Geometrical problems by him. Add to this that he is a very worthy and respectable member of society. He is a free man.

Clearly from Jefferson's tone and language, he was expressing an opinion decidedly at variance with the accepted learned view of the intellectual qualities of blacks. At times in his

UD 019 362

life he tried to keep others from degrading "a whole race of men from the rank in the scale of beings which their Creator may perhaps have given them." Later he vacillated, refusing to accept the poetry of Phillis Wheatley as her own. His ambivalance caused him even to turn on Banneker when he wrote that Banneker had white help with his almanacs and Jefferson concluded:

> I have a long letter from Banneker, which shows him to have a mind of very common stature indeed.

On the other hand, Jefferson seems never to have renounced the important political position as he insisted that although blacks were inferior, they deserved equal rights.

Jefferson was the paradigm of the scientific gentlemen of his century. The prevailing opinion had been set down by a truly distinguished name in the history of science some years earlier. That was Carl von Linné or Linnaeus, the Swedish botanist, who proposed the modern system of classification for plants and animals. His classification for man recognized four varieties:

> Homo sapiens Europeis ulbescens (white Europeans)—white, sanguine, brawny . . . Governed by customs.
> Homo sapiens Asiaticus fucus (darkish Asians)—yellow, melancholy, rigid . . . Governed by opinions.
> Homo sapiens Americanus rubenscens (red Americans)—choleric, erect . . . Regulated by habit.
> Homo sapiens Africanus negreus (black Africans)—black, phlegmatic, relaxed . . . Governed by caprice.

It is difficult to believe that Linnaeus got so many insults into such a narrow compass, beginning of course with the implied inferiority of placing blacks last and ending with "governed by caprice."

From Linnaeus through Jefferson for almost 200 years, the treatment of blacks by scientists was hardly distinguishable from the writings of the most vicious racists. L. A. Newby, in his *Jim Crow's Defense—Anti-Negro Thought in America, 1900-1930*, notes:

> The Twentieth Century began with reputable scientists and scholars as the chief authorities for racist ideas. During the 1920's and 1930's, however, their groups changed their minds and came to see environment as the source of racial inequality.

No one should rush away believing that with the 20's or 30's everything was set straight. Such is the persistence of ideas that we shall be plagued by many of the oppressive and insulting opinions far into the future. Racists do not seek nor do they need rationally-defined and non-pejorative racial differences. They will mine the ancient veins left by the Beans, Stoddards, Lindberghs, Georges, and Garnetts.

From this history we can get a better grasp of the problems confronting blacks as objects of scientific inquiry by examining two fields briefly: genetics and psychology. My opinion is that science now insists upon the view that while differences do exist among groups of human beings, which may conveniently be called races, that there is no support for the opinion that a given man in one group is necessarily superior to another from a second group, even though the mean of some measurable characteristic for the second group is below that of the first group. Moreover, small differences between means must be interpreted with extreme caution. Perhaps the position to keep in mind is that of S. L. Washburn in his address to the American Anthropological Society and reported in I. M. Lerner's book, *Heredity, Evolution, and Society*:

> I am sometimes surprised to hear it stated that if Negroes were given an equal opportunity, their IQ would be the same as whites. If one looks at the degree of social discrimination against Negroes and their lack of education, and also takes into account the tremendous amount of overlapping between the observed IQ's of both, one can make an equally good case that, given a comparable chance to that of whites, their IQ's would test out ahead. Of course, it would be absolutely unimportant in a democratic society if this were to be true, because the vast majority of individuals of both groups would be of comparable intelligence, whatever the mean of these intelligence tests would show.

The position of Dr. Washburn gains support from the earlier experiences of another ethnic group whose misfortunes during the harsh middle ages were thus described by the historian, H. Graetz:

> The Jew-badge was an invitation to the gamin to insult the wearers and to bespatter them with mud; it

> was a suggestion to stupid mobs to fall upon them, to maltreat them, and even to kill them; and it afforded the higher class an opportunity to ostracize the Jews, to plunder them, or to exile them. Worse than this outward dishonor was the influence of the badge on the Jews themselves. They became more and more accustomed to their ignominious position, and lost all feeling of self-respect. They neglected their outward appearance. They became more and more careless of their speech, because they were not admitted to cultural circles, and in their own midst they could make themselves understood by means of a jargon. They lost all taste and sense of beauty, and to some extent became despicable, as their enemies desired them to be.

Change Jew to black—who is encased in his badge—and this passage is an excellent description of the black experiences in America.

Genetics

The explanations deriving from anthropology and mentioned ahead were accompanied by works dealing with the anatomy, physiology and dermatology, all supporting the thesis of black differences as being equivalent to inherent inferiority. Practically all these fields have become quiet in this regard and the problem areas now are the newer fields, chief among them are genetics and psychology. We must not give the impression that even the most competent and respected scientists in these fields espoused racist views. In fact the situation differs in the two fields: in genetics it is the results that are being used not by geneticists but by others; while in psychology there are some psychologists and especially educational psychologists expressing ideas of inferiority in intelligence among blacks.

Within genetics the topic that has lead to most publicity relates to the inheritance of a recessive blood disease, sickle cell anemia. Perhaps no topic has contributed to the confused romanticism that envelops many things associated with blacks as much as this disease. Understanding the mechanism of inheritance and the incidence of other genetically determined illness might dispel some of the romantic notions.

To begin, sickle cell is a serious blood disease which results from a couple each carrying within the germ cells the sickling gene. Our body cells get half their genes from one parent and half from the other. When both parents contribute the defective gene, the offspring has the disorder. This is the inheritance route of all disorders caused by having two defective genes of the same type, whether in man or any other animal. If you have only one defective gene from one parent, and the other gene is normal, then you do not have the disease. This is referred to as the inheritance of a recessive genetic trait. Careful study in recent years has revealed a large number of such diseases which are being actively studied. Sickle cell disease among American blacks and Tay-Sachs disease among Jews are the two best known.

It is essential, however, that we keep clearly in mind that sickle cell is just one of many such diseases. Serious, yes, with one in ten blacks carrying a recessive gene and one in 400 blacks having the disease. Keep in mind that there are roughly 500 diseases known to be caused by a dominant genetic mutation—one is hypercholesterolaemia, when the body manufactures too much cholesterol. Keep in mind, too, that while one in 400 blacks have the disease, approximately 3% of all births are physically defective and 10% of all births are mentally defective. Right now no one knows how many are genetic defects and how many are environmental. Some geneticists believe that 95% of all disease is either inherited or influenced by inherited factors.

Another point to remember is that when two seemingly normal blacks marry and each has a defective sickle cell gene, the probability is 75% that a child will be ostensibly normal and 25% that it will have the disease. Surely then, blacks must consider competent genetic counseling, as should everyone else.

The characteristic of sickle cell disease that has aroused great scientific interest has been the directness of its mechanism. We know now that the genes go into parts of the cells of our bodies called chromosomes. Here they deter-

mine how molecules are constructed for the body's use. The sickle cell gene determines how the red blood cell molecule, hemoglobin, is constructed from the smaller units called amino acids. The long chain molecule is assembled in a definite manner as directed by the genes. Normal gene compliment directs an amino acid threonine to position 4 of the beta chain of hemoglobin, proline to position 5, glutamic acid to both position 6 and 7 and so on. The sickle cell does the same thing for all positions including 4, 5, and 7 but directs an amino acid valine to position 6. This is hemoglobin-S. So the only difference among several hundred amino acids is that valine is in 6th position rather than glutamic acid. To find that such great physiological differences could be occasioned by a single amino acid substitution deepened the respect of scientists for the subtleties of our molecular structure.

Another misconception about sickle cell anemia is the notion that it is found exclusively among blacks. Weiner reminds us:

> In India haemoglobin-S (sickle-cell haemoglobin) is common in many of the aboriginal tribes. Amongst the Paniyans and Irulas the frequency of the gene reaches nearly twenty per cent, and thirty per cent of the people possess sickle cells. The likely explanation here, as elsewhere, is the resistance that sickle cell trait confers against endemic malignant tertian malaria.

The final statement on sickle cell derives from Weiner's final point. It is widely believed now that a seemingly normal person with only one sickle cell gene, a person carrying the trait, has a definite advantage in living in the heavily malaria-infested regions of Africa. Thus, the occurrence of sickle cell trait in the Congo goes from one per cent in the Tutsi to thirty-six per cent in the people living at the

Ethnic Group	Relatively high frequency	Relatively low frequency
Ashkenazic Jews	A-betalipoproteinemia Bloom's disease Dystonia musculorum deformans Factor XI (PTA) deficiency Familial dysautonomia Gaucher's disease Niemann-Pick disease Pentosuria Spongy degeneration of brain Stub thumbs Tay-Sachs disease	Phenylketonuria
Mediterranean peoples (Greeks, Italians, Sephardic Jews)	Familial Mediterranean fever G-6-PD deficiency, Mediterranean type Thalassemia (mainly beta)	Cystic fibrosis
Africans	G-6-PD deficiency, African type Hemoglobinopathies, esp. Hb S, HB C	Cystic fibrosis Hemophilia Phenylketonuria Wilson's disease
Japanese (Koreans)	Acatalasia Dyschromatosis universalis hereditaria Oguchi's disease	
Chinese	Alpha thalassemia G-6-PD deficiency, Chinese type Familial Mediterranean fever	
Armenians	Familial Mediterranean fever	

foot of the Ruwenzari Mountains. Malaria follows the same pattern; hence, malaria seems to have a strong selective influence on the haemoglobin-S frequency. Thus, it is something our ancestors brought from Africa that is akin to similar genetic developments in other people. Genetic counseling should help. Tragically, there is no cure for the disease.

A table of racial and ethnic diseases that have proved to be simply inherited disorders following the sickle cell anemia pattern may be helpful in dispelling any special distress that blacks may feel over the disease.

What these frequency data reveal is the rather widespread distribution among various peoples of such genetic disorders. Hence, they occur as a natural result of a group's history. And in some instances they may be shown to give distinct advantages in the environment in which they arose—as sickle cell trait seems to protect against malaria—but they have become liabilities in the changed environment.

Although there is no cure for sickle cell disease, government researchers are conducting trials with the chemicals cyanate and carbamyl phosphate, which seem to counteract the rigidity of the defective hemoglobin molecule without affecting its ability to transport oxygen. Another development that you will hear more about are the amniocentesis tests wherein cells are extracted from the child within the mother's womb. If the child is found defective, the family would have to weigh the emotional burden of an ailing child with their attitude towards abortion. Surprisingly there is no evidence as to whether the trait carriers, the one in ten blacks with the defective gene, have a higher-than-average incidence of serious health problems which can be attributed to the gene. Study is underway.

Where this study and others will lead must be watched carefully. And blacks have vested concern in insuring that such genetic diseases as sickle cell, Tay-Sachs, and others do not catapult some people into advocating an unwarranted interpretation of these phenomena so that the eugenics that is reappearing does not automatically mark such carriers for extinction. One wonders how far we are ahead of the crude but vicious brutality of the "race hygiene" of Germany which culminated in their sterilization laws and genocide.

Fortunately there seems to be not a single geneticist of reputation who is advocating any interpretation that is inimical to blacks. One hundred years back that was not the case. For then, Sir Francis Galton, a founder of the science of heredity, in his *Hereditary Genius* (1869) was advocating that racial improvement was a matter of many generations of excellent genetic selectivity. The Negro he described as "childish, stupid and simpleton-like." There had never been a Negro genius he insisted. To him blacks were indeed poor eugenic material. Such attitudes as this, lying below the surface, when coupled with a fabricated scare associated with a genetic disease could develop actions to our peril.

Blacks as Objects in Psychology

The controversial segments in psychology relate to the interpretation of the scores of blacks on IQ tests and the resolution of whether every ethnic group has a distinctive pattern of intellectual strengths and weakness largely unreachable by schooling. Of the two, the first has received by far the most attention—attention that has been raucous, bitter and damaging. Interestingly one of the earliest attempts to characterize the mental qualities of blacks in America came in the national census of 1840. The writer of that report seemed to be obsessed with the idea that blacks should be in slavery. Hence his data on mental illness among blacks showed an amazing increase in the percentage and number of mentally ill blacks as you passed from the slave to the free states. His data showed that "insane and idiots" were eleven times higher in incidence among free Negroes than among slaves. In the North there was one insane to every 144.5 blacks; in the South, one insane among every 1558 blacks. The treat-

ment was so bad that the American Statistical Association and a group of New York blacks petitioned Congress in 1844 to change the census report after investigation revealed the spurious nature of the data, e.g., some Northern towns showed more insane Negroes than the total Negro population. Congress declined.

Moreover, all the other materials denigrating blacks have usually had a reference to or intimation of the inherent inferiority of blacks especially in relation to whites with regard to all things of the intellect. John C. Calhoun of South Carolina as Senator and vice-president was consistent in his disparagement of the learning potential of blacks. These actions of Calhoun were in spite of the example of Dr. James McCune Smith (1813-1865), perhaps the first black to earn the Doctor of Medicine in America. Smith took his B.A. and M.D. at the University of Glasgow in Scotland in 1835 and 1837 and returned to New York to practice medicine. He worked vigorously in behalf of improving the lot of blacks and was one of those protesting the Census of 1840 before Congress. He was a vigorous pamphleteer and his publications were surely known to Calhoun.

From Calhoun to World War I there was little change in attitude and little new emphasis. Galton, Gustav Le Bon and others brought in little new evidence. It was with the advent of intelligence testing that the field was galvanized. George Oscar Ferguson, Professor of Psychology at the University of Virginia, set the pattern in his *The Psychology of the Negro* (1916). He set the pattern in generalizing far beyond his data. His data were interpreted to show that the average IQ of whites was 100 and that of blacks only 75. Later he modified his conclusions to reflect a new experime[illegible] 69.27% for pure Negroes; 73.2% for 7[illegible] Negroes; 81.2% for mullatoes (half-whit[illegible] 98.7% for quadroons; with whites at 100%. His editorializing lead him to such explanatory contributions as that black mental development ceased at puberty; but, of course, his animal and sexual development continued vigorously. Hence, he was physically and sexually mature but having no restraints attributable to mental maturity. A deadened intellect. Moral retardation. Ferguson seemed to believe without hesitation that the differences in intelligence were innate. And this is the attitude that has persisted.

The persistence of the attitude has been challenged by an approach based upon the position that the environment plays such a major role in the lives of everyone, that improved living conditions might mean the reduction of any difference measured by any honest psychometric instrument. Hence, the idea of the innate inferiority of blacks would have to be renounced. The contest then would be between heredity and environment with the first proponents believing that nothing could be done by congenial, supportive living—with the followers, avowed or not, of Ferguson tending to throw their support on the side of heredity. Thus the lists were drawn for battle.

We are prone to consider this heredity versus environment or nature/nurture argument as exclusively a black-white or black-nonblack affair. On the contrary, this old contentious question of ability and environment rages today in Malaysia where the Malays have the role of the blacks, and Chinese of the whites. All the old epithets have been marched out: the Malays are "romantic idlers." The government policy strongly favors the Malays. Half the places in the universities and most of the overseas scholarships are reserved for them. "The Chinese student, whose examination marks are better but sees himself placed lower on the list than an inferior local boy, can only grind his teeth in impotent protest."

In America the question has fluctuated in social interest. Right now it is again in the fore primarily as a result of a long, provocative, difficult article by Arthur R. Jensen, Professor of Educational Psychology at the University of California, Berkeley, with the irritating title, "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" in the *Harvard Educational*

Review, the Winter 1969 issue. Joining Jensen were a host of others, with Professor Richard Hernnstein of Harvard and William Shockley of Stanford as the better-known cohorts, although each had reached his position through independent reasoning. Their common position was that there were racial differences in intelligence and blacks lack a significant bit of the intelligence that biology gives to whites. The argument continues though the critics of Jensen and his group seem to have carried the day. An experiment conducted by Dr. Barbara Tizard at the Institute of Education, London, in trying to separate genetic from environmental factors by working with white and black children in infant institutions in a series of verbal and non-verbal tests, found no differences between the ability of black, white and mixed-race children. She believed that detected differences by others resulted from differences in the micro-environment of the family, such as linguistic practices and attitude towards achievement.

Still the many refutations and alternative explanations meant little in my opinion until the publication of a truly great paper that all of us should be acquainted with by Professor David Layzer of Harvard. He published in *Science* on March 29, 1974, the paper "Heritability Analysis of IQ Scores: Science or Numerology." With careful analysis he revealed himself a master of the complex analysis of genetic data and scientific methodology. Since the article is a serious scientific document, it requires some background especially in mathematics, but his conclusions are startlingly forthright:

> (1) Published analyses of IQ data provide no support whatever for Jensen's thesis that inequalities in cognitive performance are due largely to genetic differences . . .
>
> (2) Under prevailing social conditions, no valid inferences can be drawn from IQ data concerning systematic genetic differences among races or socioeconomic groups. Research along present lines directed toward this end—whatever its ethical status—is scientifically worthless.
>
> (3) Since there are no suitable data for estimating the narrow heritability of IQ, it seems pointless to speculate about the prospects for a hereditary meritocracy based on IQ.

You would like to believe that such a devastating critique as Layzer's would drive these folk from the temple indefinitely. They will return.

We have seen that in the fields of science where blacks have been the subject matter of research, there is overwhelming evidence that the scientists have not revealed themselves as value-free—an expressed tenet of science. Too often the interpretation of results have followed the prevailing racist idea. Notwithstanding this sordid history we must not overlook the eventual triumph of the self-correcting method of science as eventually the interpretation has changed to one less pejorative and vilifying. Lucretius recognized this property of science around 2000 years ago when he characterized science as liberating man from the tyranny of the gods. More recently, Bertrand Russell expressed this cleansing property of the power of science as the most effective solvent for unwarranted beliefs that mankind has ever known.

Black Scientists and Engineers

In a sense, however, we have considered science so far as a collection of problem-solving techniques rather than as a coherent social activity which has inherited the primary responsibility for the fate of the modern world. Science and technology take a lion's share of all of our educational, industrial, and research budgets and affect, if not determine, almost all areas of our daily lives. A short while back I was leafing through the April 11, 1974 issue of the *New Scientist*, a British weekly, where I found that the University of Ife (Nigeria) was advertising for a Professor of Plant Science, a Professor of Agricultural Economics, a Professor of Soil Science, and a Senior Lecturer in Soil Science. The University of Sierre Leone was advertising, too, for similarly trained people. What distressed me was the realization that from the 22 million blacks in the United States these universities can expect little or no help—we are not producing scientists and other technically-trained people

despite the importance of these disciplines.

In order to understand our position we must go back before the Civil War, when we find that the first black to complete an American college is usually thought to have been John Brown Russwurm (1799-1851), who graduated from Bowdoin College in 1826. There is fairly convincing evidence, however, that he was preceded by Alexander Lucius Twilight (1795-1857), who took his degree at Middlebury College in August, 1823. Moreover, Ernest Jones had taken his degree at Amherst, whose commencement was three weeks before Bowdoin's, also in 1826. We have already read that James McCune Smith (1813-1865) had taken a medical degree at the University of Glasgow, Scotland, in 1837; nevertheless, by the time of the Civil War in 1860, out of 488,070 free blacks in the country, only 28 had received degrees from recognized colleges. The total population of blacks was 4,441,830 (14.1% of the population). With such a formidable deficit only 110 years ago, you could accept any progress by blacks as startling.

Our sympathy is misplaced, for in forty years the blacks had made great progress with the 1900 census revealing that blacks counted among their numbers:

21,268 teachers	99 literary and scientific persons
15,530 clergymen	1734 physicians
728 lawyers	212 dentists
210 journalists	120 engineers and surveyors

Again, between 1900 and 1974 we have shown remarkable absolute growth in the two fields of greatest interest to us, physicians and engineers. The figures now are that we have 14,800 in the engineering field (1.2% of the total) of which 8,100 have degrees in engineering or closely related fields. While for medicine the figures are for 1970, 5,055 black male physicians and 1,051 black female physicians out of a total of 324,942 physicians, about 2%. Thus we may state that since 1900 there has been a 3.5 fold increase in black physicians and a whopping 123 fold increase in the number of engineers. Conversely, however, the important consideration is percentage of total, with blacks only 1.2% of the engineers and 2% of the physicians while we are 12% of the total population. You can rightly ask what factors have operated to keep us so poorly represented in these important fields. Unwillingly we learn, too, that these two scientific and technical fields have good representation in comparison with the doctorates in the natural sciences for example—an alarming situation both with respect to numbers and distribution.

What concerns us is not only the very low figures on the production of black doctorates, not only their unfavorable distribution in the various fields, but now the recent federal court decisions that will lead to embarrassing experiences in view of the many more opportunities available for black Ph.D.'s. Another game of academic musical chairs may be upon us.

The court decision referred to emanated from the United States Court of Appeals on June 12, 1973. It affirmed the earlier ruling of Judge Pratt of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the case of Adams vs. Richardson that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) must enforce Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which would end segregation in public educational institutions receiving federal funds. Specifically, Judge Pratt's ruling forces HEW to institute compliance procedures against ten state-operated systems of higher education.

One essential component of compliance must be, so it seems, the hiring of more black faculty members in the state systems. This is exemplified by the State of Florida whose plan, described in the New York Times on June 27, 1973, projects that the eight predominantly white schools in the state higher education system will increase their black faculty from the present 161 blacks in a total of 5712 faculty members to 482 in a total of 8336 by 1977. This increase of 321 might seem modest enough until you conjecture that if these college teachers expect to find satisfy-

ing, rewarding careers in higher education, all should have doctorates. Extending this modest figure of approximately 300 more black faculty members per state system, we confront a numerical requirement of some 3000 more black college faculty members over the next four years. Most, if not all, should have doctorates.

Nevertheless, we should not abandon the moral principle that even if the court decisions did not exist, a society which does not provide for its largest minority group to gain the intellectual training essential for significant careers in so many areas has a genuine responsibility to correct such social unwholesomeness. We must, then, call attention to some specific program plans in this memorandum. Viewing with alarm cannot suffice in 1978.

The Facts

The first study of especial relevance is that conducted by Dr. James W. Bryant for the Ford Foundation in 1968. His data supported the assumption that less than 1% of America's earned doctorate holders were black. The study discovered 2280 blacks with earned doctorates. The responses on fields of specialization from 1096 of them were as follows: (Set 1)

Field	Number	Percent
Education	313	28.6
Social Sciences	288	26.3
Biological Sciences	142	12.9
Humanities	136	12.4
Physical Sciences	129	11.8
Other	88	8.0
Total	1096	100.0%

These data should be compared with the U.S. Office of Education's figures which revealed that 839,730 bachelor's degrees, 230,509 master's degrees and 32,107 doctor's degrees were conferred in 1970-1971. The percentages thus are as follows: master's degrees, 27.45% of the bachelor's degrees; doctor's degrees, 13.93% of the master's degrees and 3.82% of the bachelor's degrees.

The doctorates according to fields from the same U.S.O.E. study showed: (Set 2)

Field	Percent
Education	19.9
Social Sciences	11.4
Biological Sciences	11.4
Physical Sciences	13.7
Engineering	11.3
All other fields	32.3
Total	100.0%

The next set of data we need is also from a Ford Foundation survey of Ph.D. degrees awarded from 1964 through 1968. Some 63 American graduate schools reported that of the 37,456 degrees awarded, 294 (0.8 of one percent) were received by black Americans. Moreover, 64 graduate schools reported for 1967-1968 that of the 174,615 students enrolled, only 3012 (1.72%) were black.

Another set of data may be taken from the report of the Southern Fellowship Fund of Atlanta, Georgia, which has been conducting a program of encouraging and supporting blacks and others who plan careers in predominantly black colleges to work for graduate degrees, primarily with support from the Danforth Foundation. The Fund's report to the Council of Southern Universities for March 1973 reveals that 127 of their grantees received doctorates in the years 1969-1972. (Note: Some, a very few though, were not black.) The fields in which the degrees were received were these: (Set 3)

Field	Number	Percent x 100
Education	63	.496
Social Sciences	17	.134
Biological Sciences	11	.087
Physical Sciences (chem.)	6	.047
Engineering	2	.016
Other	28	.220
Total	127	1.000

The final set of data has been distributed by a school which has put forth commendable effort in recruiting blacks, Ohio State. They showed that the 37 blacks there who expected

to receive doctorates either in the spring or summer of 1973 were in the following fields:

(Set 4)

Botany	1
Education	23
English	2
Music	1
Physical Education	3
Speech Communication	3
Agricultural Education	1
Engineering Mechanics	1
Home Economics Education	1
Physics	1
Total	37

Observe that 28 are in Education, 76% of the total.

A few conclusions, more or less alarming, immediately hit you on reflecting on these data, especially sets 1, 2, 3, and 4. First, of course, is the unbelievable low rate of production of blacks with earned doctorates. Blacks are about 12% of the population; thus, a production rate of 0.8 for black doctorates cannot be countenanced. A second reference is that doctorates in Education constituted 28.6% of the blacks with doctorates in 1968 (set 1), while only 19.9% of all doctor's degrees were awarded in education in 1970-1971 (set 2), which reveals a strong channeling of blacks away from other fields, especially from engineering. Additionally, 26.3% of the blacks (set 1) were in the social sciences, while only 11.4% of all degrees in 1970-1971 (set 2) were in those fields. Most alarming, however, are the conclusions from sets 3 and 4, which reveal a headlong rush into Education of the recent graduates of the Southern Fellowship Fund group of 50% (set 3) and the Ohio State group (set 4) of 67%.

What needs to be corrected then, are these two clearly highlighted areas:

1. There is severe need for national programs that will increase by manyfold the number of blacks who succeed in strong, respected doctoral degree programs across the nation.
2. These blacks must enter the disciplines which are most appropriate for the needs of society. The piling up in education must not be continued.

The Bachelor's Population From Which We Can Draw

No matter how fervent our commitment there remains the question of whether we can find blacks for Ph.D. programs. Opinion will be rampant here where many factors have to be considered. My feeling is that at Lincoln, from among 220 students who graduated in June 1973, there were perhaps 40 or 60 who had the intellectual competencies to earn doctorates in their undergraduate fields.

Fortunately we have a set of data on total bachelor's degrees in academic areas from 95 of the 110 predominantly black colleges and universities from 1966-1970, as reported by James A. Welch of the Institute for Services to Education, Washington, D. C.

Total Bachelor's Degrees by Academic Areas (95 schools)

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Agriculture	80	82	115	175	136
Biological Sci.	1155	1052	1226	1324	1289
Business & Comm.	1014	1046	1485	2019	2654
Education	7821	7485	7633	8375	9233
English & Journ.	1015	1003	1265	1249	1190
Engineering	273	212	206	312	366
Health Fields	301	450	483	497	540
Mathematics	797	733	803	911	797
Physical Education	973	946	1006	1020	1191
Physical Sci.	566	623	800	609	488
Social Sci.	2633	2698	4155	4419	3573
Total Degrees	18437	18414	22141	24006	25240

I have no such data on blacks graduating from predominantly white schools. Assuming for the present that they are at least equal in number to these graduates from the predominantly black schools, we have approximately 50,000 young black people with Bachelor's degrees each year. Returning to the U.S. Office of Education factor (set 1) wherein doctor's degrees were 3.82% of the bachelor's degrees, we can project that 1900 young blacks should—or must—receive doctor's degrees each year, rather than the approximately 300 or so who now qualify for such degrees.

New Programs

From these results, whatever programs are in existence, there is a pristinely clear need for additional programs that will not only afford access to graduate education by the underprivileged minority groups, but also heighten the success of these young people in such programs in all disciplines. This problem may well be the test problem for the vitality and creativity of graduate education in America.

Purposefully I have avoided discussion of the idiosyncratic qualities of the doctor's degree in most graduate schools. Neither have I essayed any detailed discussion of these young black candidates—their motivation, sustained attention, habits of work and thought, values, adjustment, and social maturity. Opting for only 3.82% of the bachelor's degree holders emerges as a modest enough factor.

We have some heartening information from what has been accomplished in medicine. Here the medical schools with some assist from the National Medical Fellowships, Inc., a group which raised and will distribute about $2 million this year to aid minority students almost exclusively in the first two years of medical school, have dramatically increased the number of blacks entering medicine in a very short time. The figures reported are these:

The First-Year Class in Medical Schools in the U.S.A.

School Year	Total	Total Minority	Black
1969-70	10,422	501	440
1970-71	11,348	808	697
1971-72	12,361	1060	881

Thus, the black freshman enrollment doubled in the two-year interval. Inasmuch as the failure rate in medical school is negligible, most of these young people will graduate after four years.

A Specific Plan

Always in situations charged with social and political import you must consider what is possible. Is it realistic to plan for a modest effort modelled after the National Medical Fellowships, Inc., or should you take cognizance of the great social need, of the Florida Compliance Plan, and the other state plans to follow, and aim for say another 1000 more black earned doctorates each year?

We could have an office located at some school which would canvass the historically black colleges and other colleges for students each year for graduate study. There would be visits, interviews, talks, not just literature. In addition, the graduate schools would be visited with a view to finding departments, sound but sensitive, which would accept these students with the aim of their going through a four-year program of rigorous, demanding, intellectual work culminating in the degree. Right now I would favor overwhelmingly the Ph.D. or a few Ed.D.'s, not a D.A. The important point is that it must be a sound degree, not immediately suspect.

Such a program would have to be completely subsidized. Considering the national implications and the magnitude of the effort, we must look for federal support. My estimate is that each young person would have to be completely subsidized at a cost of say $6000 each per year. Add about $200 each for administrative costs and your 1000 young blacks per year would cost about $6.2 million annually. When the program would come to equilibrium in four years, your annual costs would be of the order of $25 million—a small investment for so much social good.

Engineering

The program sketched ahead at the doctoral level for blacks remains a hope. Fortunately the engineering profession has begun the steps in a program to increase significantly the representation of minorities, meaning blacks and Spanish-surnamed people primarily, in engineering. The specific goals set are to increase freshmen and transfer minority engineering enrollments over 1972 by 100% in 1974 and 200% in 1976. The efforts have now the support and leadership of the National

Academy of Engineering although the earlier effort was spearheaded by a few companies, notably the General Electric Company. The Sloan Foundation has a task force that will report on minorities in engineering shortly. Hence we should soon see some meaningful effort. The one disconcerting feature is that effective effort seems to be costing out at a very high level. Moreover, any effort will have to be for a considerable period. That combination of high cost and long-term commitment may divert attention. Realism and genuine dedication may keep enough at work to initiate and maintain an effective program. A decided plus is the sincere willingness of major companies and industries to employ minority engineers and the very favorable job-market predictions over the next decade.

Retrospect and Prospect

For blacks, then, the career possibilities in the sciences and engineering appear inviting. There must be a national effort to do something more in aiding them to take advantage of opportunities for study at the freshman college level both in science and engineering. The normal pattern in the secondary schools for blacks is not succeeding in preparing them for this college work, really it is failing miserably. Some groups must intervene with supplemental aid both in gaining knowledge and in motivation, in career choice, and in habits of work and thought.

In my view this is our most critical assignment over the next three or four decades if we wish to insure that blacks will be able to influence the direction of events and the factors which impact on their lives. Perhaps we should concern ourselves least with the worries and anxieties resulting from the misuse of scientific data on blacks. It is infuriating and one always should have his own experts to insure fair treatment and accuracy. A significant number of blacks at work in science and engineering at all levels and in all avenues of applied and pure research would be the finest guardian of our future rights.